



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,596	03/29/2004	Dan Gaur	PI18327	3217
50890	7590	08/11/2008	EXAMINER	
CAVEN & AGHEVLI			FOUD, HICHAM B	
c/o INTELLEVATE, LLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 52050				2619
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/812,596	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GAUR, DAN
	<b>Examiner</b> HICHAM B. FOUD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/22/2008 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

2. The amendment filed on 05-22-2008 has been entered and considered.

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application.

Claims 21-23 have been added.

Claims 1-23 remain rejected as discussed below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7-12, 16 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lay (US 2005/0033531) in view of Hara et al (US 2004/0081090).

For claim 1, Lay discloses a method comprising: determining network parameters corresponding to a network (see paragraph 0026; wherein "the resource management measures resource usage of receiving buffers of the network connected to the router 160"); determining host interface parameters corresponding to a host (see paragraph 0026; wherein "the resource management measures resource usage of destination buffers connected to one of the hosts 120-140"); setting a storage threshold capacity of a storage device based on at least one network parameter and at least one host interface parameter (see Figure 2; wherein resource measurement engine control the threshold capacity in the flow control logic and [0026] lines 4-7; congestion status reached "threshold" based on a specific port usage and other values); and transmitting a request to stop transmission of traffic to the storage device based the storage device exceeding the storage threshold capacity (see Figure 2; wherein pause on engine transmits a pause frame when exceeding the threshold). Lay discloses all the subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing that the storing device is to only store data to be communicated between the host and the network. However, Hara et al discloses a storing device is to only store data to be communicated between the host and the network (see Figure 1 element 1 and the link  $\alpha$  which is connecting the SW 1 to last box which is considered the host). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the method of Hara et al into the invention of Lay for the purpose of connecting the whole network to a single host via the storage device or switch to maximize the storage capacity for the single host.

For claims 2 and 11, Lay discloses a method and an apparatus further comprising adjusting the storage threshold capacity based on changes to a network parameter (See Figure 5; wherein the change in measuring resource which can depend on the network parameter (receiving buffers) cause the transmission of a pause frame in case of exceeding the threshold or going back to measuring the resource usage in case of not exceeding the threshold).

For claims 3 and 12, Lay discloses a method and an apparatus further comprising adjusting the storage threshold capacity based on changes to a host interface parameter (See Figure 5; wherein the change in measuring resource which can depend on the host interface parameter (destination buffers) cause the transmission of a pause frame in case of exceeding the threshold or going back to measuring the resource usage in case of not exceeding the threshold).

For claim 7, Lay discloses a method further comprising transmitting a request to allow transmission of traffic (see Figure 5; wherein the transmission of Pause off packet is a request to allow transmission of traffic).

For claims 8 and 16, Lay discloses an apparatus and a system comprising: a host system comprising a processor and a memory (see Figure 1, switch 150; inherently, switch 150 has a processor and a memory to function); an interface (see Figure 1, the connection between switch 110 and switch 150); a storage device to store received traffic (see Figure 1; wherein a storage device is inherent in the switch 110 since the adaptive flow control system measures the resources as shown in Figure 2 and the storage device is mentioned in paragraph 0026; wherein "the resource

management measures resource usage of receiving buffers"); and a controller to manage the transmission of traffic to the storage device (see Figure 1, adaptive flow control system), wherein the controller is configured to: determine at least one network parameter corresponding to a network (see paragraph 0026; wherein "the resource management measures resource usage of receiving buffers of the network connected to the router 160"); determine at least one host interface parameter corresponding to a host (see paragraph 0026; wherein "the resource management measures resource usage of destination buffers connected to one of the hosts 120-140"); set a storage threshold capacity of the storage device based on at least one network parameter and at least one host interface parameter (See Figure 5; wherein the change in measuring resource which can depend on the host interface parameter and network parameter (receiving buffers and destination buffers) and [0026] lines 4-7; congestion status reached "threshold" based on a specific port usage and other values) cause the transmission of a pause frame in case of exceeding the threshold or going back to measuring the resource usage in case of not exceeding the threshold); monitor storage conditions of a storage device (see Figure 5; the loopback to measuring the resource usage in case of not exceeding the threshold) ; and transmit a request to stop transmission of traffic based on the storage device exceeding the storage threshold capacity (see Figure 5; wherein pause on frame has been transmitted when exceeding the threshold). Lay discloses all the subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing that the storing device is to only store data to be communicated between the host and the network. However, Hara et al discloses a storing device is to only store

data to be communicated between the host and the network (see Figure 1 element 1 and the link a which is connecting the SW 1 to last box which is considered the host). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the method of Hara et al into the invention of Lay for the purpose of connecting the whole network to a single host via the storage device or switch to maximize the storage capacity for the single host.

For claim 9, Lay discloses an apparatus further comprising a physical layer interface to transfer received traffic to the storage device (see Figure 1, the physical layer that connects elements 120, 130 and 140 to the switch 110).

For claim 10, Lay discloses an apparatus wherein the controller is further configured to perform media access control processing in compliance with IEEE 802.3x (see Figure 1, wherein the system is Full Duplex and flow control which are the description of the Ethernet standard of 802.3x dated 1997).

For claim 19, Lay discloses a system further comprising a storage device coupled to the interface (see Figure 1, the connection between switch 110 and switch 150; wherein the storage device is inherent in the switch 110).

For claim 20, Lay discloses a system wherein the network parameters correspond to a network coupled to the storage device via a link partner that transmits traffic to the storage device (see Figure 1, wherein switch 150 is connected through link to switch 110 that has storage for received traffic from the network).

For claims 21-22, Lay discloses a physical medium to couple the storage device to a switch/hub, wherein the storage device is to couple to the network via the

Art Unit: 2619

switch/hub (see Figure 1 wherein the router is considered the network that is couple the switch/hub "150' by the physical medium "the connection line to the elements" to the storage device "110").

For claim 23, Lay discloses a host interface to couple the host and the storage device (see figure 1 the connection between PC "120" and element 110), wherein the host interface is to allow the host to communicate with the network via the storage device (see figure 1 wherein PC "120" is communicating to the network connected to the router "160" via the storage device "110").

4. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lay in view of Hara et al and further in view of Middleton et al (US 2005/0207387) hereinafter is referred to as Middleton and further in view of Hao (US 2003/0172220).

For Claims 4 and 13, Lay further suggested that the network parameter could be besides the receiving buffers, and total resource usage, any other factors of the switch (see paragraph 0026). Lay in view of Hara et al discloses all the subject matter with the exception of wherein the network parameter includes a plurality of: link speed of a network that transmits traffic to the storage device; signal propagation speed of a physical medium that transfers traffic from the network to the storage device and length of the physical medium that transfers traffic. However, Middleton discloses a method wherein the network introduces some parameters which are link speed of a network that transmits traffic to the storage device (see [0055] lines 1-7); signal propagation speed of a physical medium that transfers traffic from the network to the storage device and length of the physical medium that transfers traffic (see [0054] lines 1-6). Thus, it would

have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Middleton's network parameters into the system of Lay in view of Hara et al for the purpose of identifying the delay introduced by the network and therefore reducing that delay. Lay in view of Hara et al and further in view of Middleton discloses all the subject matter with the exception of disclosing the maximum frame size of packets in the traffic as another network parameter. However, Hao from the same or similar field of endeavor teaches the use of a flow controller (see Figure 1, Snooping Module element 140) that uses the maximum frame size of packets in the traffic as a network parameter to control the storage threshold capacity (see paragraph 0023). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the functions of the Snooping Module as taught by Hao into the system of lay in view of Hara et al and further in view of Middleton for the purpose of increasing the system efficiency and easing the flow traffic to avoid any loss of data or overflow.

5. Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lay in view of Hara et al and further in view of Conley et al (US 7,080,162) hereinafter is referred to as Conley.

For Claims 5 and 14, Lay in view of Hara et al discloses all the subject matter without explicitly showing wherein the host interface parameter comprises a local bus speed and number of bits that can be transmitted through the bus in a single cycle. However, Lay suggested that the host parameter could be besides the destination buffers and total resource usage, any other factors of the switch (see paragraph 0026). And the transfer of data in a switch or computer is depending on the data rate that

implicitly depends on the speed of the bus because the bus is a subsystem that transfers data or power between components. Also, Conley discloses that a local bus is used between elements and preferably a 32 bit or larger bus operating at a sufficient speed (see figure 6 element 110 and column 8 lines 53-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the bus speed and number of bits that can be transmitted through the bus in a single cycle as taught by the invention of Conley into the system of Lay in view of Hara et al for the purpose of easing the flow traffic and minimizing latency.

6. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lay in view of Hara et al and further in view of Erimli et al (US 6,487,212).

For Claims 17 and 18, Lay in view of Hara et al discloses all the subject matter with the exception of wherein the interface is compatible with PCI and PCI-X. However, Erimli et al discloses a switch that includes a PCI interface that may serve as an expansion bus for switch devices (see column 5 lines 43-48). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the interface (switch) compatible with either PCI or PCI-X since PCI-X is the later revisions of PCI added new features and performance improvements, as taught by the invention of Erimli et al into the invention of Lay in view of Hara et al for the purpose of increasing the compatibility and flexibility.

7. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lay in view of Hara et al and further in view of Zimmermann et al (US 2003/0161302).

For Claims 6 and 15, Lay in view of Hara et al discloses all the subject matter with the exception of wherein the storage threshold capacity comprises a difference between total storage capacity of the storage device to store traffic from a link partner and a safety margin and wherein the safety margin comprises: (i) amount of bits that might be transmitted from the link partner while the request to stop transmission of traffic is prepared +(ii) amount of bits that might be transmitted from the link partner while the request to stop transmission of traffic is in transit to the link partner +(iii) amount of bits that might arrive to the storage device from the link partner while the link partner processes the request to stop transmission of traffic +(iv) amount of bits that the link partner might have transmitted while the link partner processes the request to stop transmission of traffic -(v) amount of bits drained from the storage device during (i) through (iv). However, Zimmermann et al discloses a method wherein if the data in the buffer reaches threshold, the coming data flow is paused and therefore a safety margin is set (see paragraph 0051). Thus it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art to adapt the method of Zimmermann et al into the system of Lay in view of Hara et al for the purpose of avoiding loss of data.

#### **Response to Argument**

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### **Conclusion**

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

**10. Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

When responding to this office action, applicants are advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which they think the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Applicants must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See 37C.F.R 1.111(c). In addition, applicants are advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and pages numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist examiner in locating the appropriate paragraphs.

**11.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hicham B. Foud whose telephone number is 571-270-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10 AM-6 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2619

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hicham B Foud/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2619  
08/03/2008

/STEVEN HD NGUYEN/  
Acting SPE of Art Unit 2619/2600